

BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

Minutes of the Regular Board of Police Commissioners Meeting Thursday, April 29, 2004

The regular meeting of the Detroit Board of Police Commissioners was held on Thursday, April 29, 2004, at 3:00 p.m., at Police Headquarters, 1300 Beaubien, Rm. 328-A, Detroit, MI 48226.

ATTENDANCE

Board Members Present

Willie E. Hampton
Arthur Blackwell, II
Erminia Ramirez
Jim Holley
Megan P. Norris

Department Personnel Present

AC Walter E. Shoulders
DC Cara Best
DC Gloria Reynolds
Cmdr. Willie Burden
Cmdr. Motley
Cmdr. Ralph Godbee
Cmdr. Walter Martin
Insp. Jamie Fields
Sgt. Omar Feliciano
Sgt. Ramona Bennett
Sgt. Debbie Jackson

Board Staff Present

Dante' L. Goss, Exec. Director **(ABS)**
Denise R. Hooks, Attorney/Supervising Inv.
Arnold Sheard, Interim Chief Investigator
Damon Nunn, Police Commission Investigator
Michelle McDonald, Community Affairs Coordinator
E. Lynise Bryant-Weekes, Personnel Director

OTHERS PRESENT

Herman Vallery
Ms. Walters

Minutes of the Regular BPC Meeting

Thursday, April 29, 2004

Page 2

Mr. Cracchiolio
Tawanna Morris
Ron Scott
Rick Jones
Bernice Smith

RECORDERS

Jerome Adams
Kellie Williams
Felicia Hardaway

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hampton called the regular meeting of the Detroit Board of Police Commissioners to order at 3:25 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: **Comm. Holley** made the motion to approve the minutes of Thursday, April 22, 2004.

SECOND: **Comm. Norris** seconded the motion

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative.

3. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Appeal Reinstatement

Comm. Hampton stated that we have a reinstatement on an appeal case for **Police Officer Jamie McFarland** that has been before the Board. Officer McFarland submitted a request to the Chief requesting reinstatement and the request was denied. The ruling governor requests for reinstatement in the case that the request might be honored at the discretion of the Chief. There

is nothing in the record that indicates the decision not to reinstate former Officer McFarland and was reduced to discretion. The Personnel Subcommittee is making the following recommendation to uphold the decision of the Department.

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to uphold the decision of the Department regarding Officer Jamie McFarland.

SECOND: **Comm. Ramirez** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative.

4. SECRETARY'S REPORT – EXEC. DIR. GOSS

CITIZEN COMPLAINTS RECEIVED

Weekly Count of Complaints: **38** **478**

2003

During the past week: 21 Year to Date: 374

****Due to the database system being down, the actual breakdown of figures are not available.**

5. REPORT/PRESENTATION – CHIEF OF POLICE

DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT

REPORT TO THE
BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

Vision Statement

BUILDING A SAFER DETROIT THROUGH COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.

The Detroit Police Department is committed to uphold its mission to provide a safe environment for our residents and business. This effort is not possible without the joint commitment of the community and the Police Department.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

On April 28, 2004, the Narcotics Enforcement Section conducted (15) enforcement actions within the city of Detroit, resulting in the following arrests and confiscations:

- ◆ 8 Felony arrests
- ◆ 28 Misdemeanor arrests
- ◆ 77.4 Grams of cocaine, 3 grams of heroin and 73.5 grams of marijuana – street value \$36,654.00
- ◆ \$983.00 U.S. currency
- ◆ 2 Vehicles
- ◆ 21 Miscellaneous Ordinances issued

On April 23, 2004, the Vice Section conducted one enforcement action within the boundaries of the Fourth Precinct, resulting in the following arrests:

- ◆ 28 Arrests for Disorderly Conduct – Flagging
- ◆ 28 Miscellaneous Ordinances issued

FIFTH PRECINCT

On April 18, 2004, two (2) subjects armed with handguns began a spree of robberies within the Seventh, Ninth and Eleventh Precincts. The description of the wanted vehicle was broadcast over the police radio. On April 19, 2004, officers of the Fifth Precinct, while on patrol, observed the wanted vehicle in the area of Chandler Park. The officers proceeded to investigate the subject and he drove off. A brief vehicle pursuit was initiated, which resulted in the subject crashing into a pole and fleeing on foot. The officers pursued the subject on foot and he was apprehended hiding under a parked vehicle in the 5000 block of Berkshire. On April 22, 2004, the subject was charged with (3) counts of Armed Robbery, (3) counts of Carjacking, (2) counts of Kidnapping, (2) counts of Felony Firearm, and (1) count of Fleeing and Eluding.

TACTICAL SERVICES SECTION

During the period of April 21-27, 2004, officers of the Tactical Services Section conducted traffic stop details within the Sixth, Eighth, Seventh and Thirteenth Precincts. The following are the results of their endeavors:

- ◆ 8 Felony arrests
- ◆ 6 Misdemeanor arrests
- ◆ 1 Handgun confiscated
- ◆ 316 Traffic Ordinance Violations issued

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

CANDLE LIGHT VIGIL AND THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEMORIAL SERVICE

In honor of the memory of officers slain in the line of duty, on May 6, 2004, at 7:00 p.m., at 1300 Beaubien, in the gymnasium, the Detroit Police Department Chaplain Corps Sixth Annual Candlelight Vigil will be held at 7:00 p.m. Additionally, on May 7, 2004, at 9:00 a.m., the Thirty-First Annual Detroit Police Department Interfaith Memorial Service will be held at the Old St. Mary's Church, located at 646 Monroe. Immediately following the service, breakfast will be served in the Atrium of Ford Field, located at 2000 Brush. All are invited to attend.

SEVENTH PRECINCT

On May 1, 2004, from 10:00 a.m., to 2:00 p.m., the Seventh Precinct Community Relations is hosting an Auto Theft Fair, at the Jefferson Chevrolet Auto Dealership, located at 2130 East Jefferson Avenue. The purpose of this fair is to inform citizens of ways to protect their vehicles from theft. The following services will be offered: 1) Etching of vehicle identification numbers on windows; 2) Raffle donating a car alarm with free installation; 3) Displays of brake locks, steering wheel locks and column locks; 4) LoJack display; and 5) Tips on how citizens can reduce auto insurance rates.

TRAINING

SPECIAL RESPONSE TEAM

On April 20, 2004, members of the Special Response Team instructed members of the Eighth Precinct on vehicle felony stop procedures and proper building searches.

CHIEF OF POLICE ELLA M. BULLY-CUMMINGS

6. PRESENTATION – FORENSIC SERVICES SECTION

The presentation was given by Lt. Joseph Marchetti, Forensic Services Section, and he was assisted by Police Officer Stephen Yakimovich, Forensic Services Section.

Questions

Comm. Holley asked if you don't provide services on the last two, who does provide them?

Lt. Marchetti answered that we go to the State Police for those two areas.

Comm. Ramirez asked is fingerprinting done for every home invasion?

Lt. Marchetti answered we go to every home invasion when we are requested by Investigators; a concept that surprises a lot of people.

Comm. Ramirez stated that there are a lot of citizens that are surprised with that.

Comm. Ramirez asked who requests it and only if it is requested by the Investigators?

Comm. Holley answered the Investigators.

Lt. Marchetti answered yes, the Investigators.

Comm. Hampton asked Lt. Marchetti if he could share with the Board, if he knows why Mississippi isn't participating?

Lt. Marchetti stated that he is not able to answer that question. They may be participating and are just not certified yet to make entry. He asked DC Reynolds is that right?

DC Reynolds answered sort of.

Comm. Norris asked how many people do you have in your group?

Lt. Marchetti asked in the total group or specific units?

Comm. Norris stated yes. She stated start with the total group and then the units.

Lt. Marchetti stated he would guess maybe 50.

Comm. Norris asked how many are in your crime scene?

Lt. Marchetti stated that the Crime Scene Unit is budgeted for 21 police officers and 15 civilian Forensic Technicians.

Comm. Norris asked in real life you have.....

Lt. Marchetti stated that currently our police manpower is down by 6.

Comm. Norris answered okay.

Comm. Norris stated you indicated that the Crime Scene Unit goes to home invasions when they are requested the Investigators. I am guessing, correct me if I am wrong, that in all cases, your people report when somebody directs them and they are not making the decisions themselves about who goes where?

Lt. Marchetti answered no; we don't make that decision. We respond when we are requested.

Comm. Norris asked when you gather fingerprints or DNA, does that automatically get ran or do you have that in case, at some later time you need to check it against something?

Lt. Marchetti stated that certain items of evidence are on file to be used at a different date. Other pieces of evidence, usually like the case of the fingerprints, we do our capabilities on the suspects so that we can manually check them, and because we are interlinked with the state's automated fingerprints system, we can enter those.

Comm. Norris stated that her question is not can you but do you? When they come and they get fingerprints or DNA; do they have that in case they need it or is it actually always ran someplace to see if there is a match? Or is it only ran on certain situations where you think you may have a suspect?

Lt. Marchetti stated that the answer is a little of all three. I think that DC Reynolds wants to answer this.

DC Reynolds stated that we provide whatever service seems appropriate for that particular case. On all home invasions, if we collect fingerprints, all of those prints will go into AFIS. She stated since the early 90's, every case where we have had DNA evidence; we have done an analysis where it would be helpful. The one thing that we had occur with DNA database is that we actually did our first upload of no suspect cases. These are cases which used to not get analyzed because there was no suspect investigate.....

Comm. Norris stated to match it against.

DC Reynolds stated to match it against. We have just loaded 19 and we have 14 disks on the

Comm. Norris stated that answers my question.

DC Reynolds stated that we are waiting on the State Police and they are swamped right now to do their validation procedure to get those back to us.

Comm. Norris asked if you have a suspect, then you have the evidence to see if you have the right guy?

DC Reynolds answered that is correct.

Comm. Norris asked if you don't have a suspect, historically, you just keep that in case a suspect

DC Reynolds answered no, I would not say that, it depends.

Comm. Norris stated it depends, okay.

DC Reynolds stated it depends on what is available. IBIS is another one. We test for our own confiscated handguns. We do whatever we can to ensure that whatever suspect develops that it is there. Sometimes it is a case of just holding on to evidence until you get something to compare it with.

Comm. Ramirez stated that I can understand now that you have stated that. There is a shortage of manpower and it would be impossible to send in your team for every home invasion.

DC Reynolds stated that it is not a difficult request. Whenever any Investigator, Precinct, or whatever unit asks for services, we never deny services. We have not had to deny a request for service.

Comm. Norris stated that if they requested it in every case that might...

DC Reynolds stated that wouldn't be appropriate. That is what an investigator does; and that's his job. When he goes to a scene, he is supposed to look at the scene and assess whether or not he thinks it would be a value to have some expert search that scene for evidence. They are not going to be right all of the time in their assessment and that is another issue. But we have not had to decline service for anyone.

Comm. Holley asked is the investigative driven all of the way or at some point, the investigator would have you come in and take the DNA, and he or she decides that it is not necessary, does it go into "Big Bertha"? Is the investigative driven all of the way?

DC Reynolds stated no it is not. That is one of the things that the investigative units for the most part, do not collect evidence in Detroit.

Homicide Section, which we do most of our work for is a partnership, and depending on the personnel in Homicide, sometimes our veteran Crime Scene officers have a little more experience at processing the scene. Crime Scene officers are charged with collecting every piece of evidence that they know should be collected at a scene. Once it gets back to the laboratory; laboratory personnel actually make the decision of what should be analyzed. Then, other times, it is not unusual that there is other evidence out there or people who need to be brought in to take blood samples and that is initiated from the Laboratory and we will dog investigators to get the appropriate evidence in so that we can do what we think needs to be done on a case.

AC Shoulders stated that it is not just for home invasions. Our command officers in precincts, Lieutenants and IOU investigators under the direction are to notify the Crime Scene Unit as much as possible. They told us at one time that they were being under used. We have every intention of overusing them. We send them out, not just to home invasions, but also for carjackings, stolen recovered vehicles because obviously, there is a possibility of always getting a print, and a person that steals one car and the odds are that he stole another car and all we want to do is get as much information and use it as a tool. So at some point and time, if they have it in the AFIS System, and if we do get someone in custody; here and in some other states that I have seen on the news lately, that the print pops up and we got him over that and that is the purpose of it. We send them out for everything that we possibly can get prints or evidence from.

Comm. Ramirez stated that she keeps hearing the investigator and that they send out your unit according to their criteria. What do you do if the citizens insist that you pull the prints and you will know who the suspect is because he has been in the area and has committed a lot of home invasions? Is it usually done by the investigator's criteria or what the citizen wants?

AC Shoulders stated that we send the officers there to get the prints and whatever evidence that it is. Citizens very seldom know the access to send them out. We send them out there and there is the likelihood of getting any type prints evidence. Our officers at the scene normally preserve the scene and try to tell the citizens not to touch anything and we try to get people out there and that comes from some of our patrol officers and supervisors on the scene and so it is to our benefit to get as much evidence as we can. We don't make that decision and once the Crime Scene Unit gets there; they can determine where something

is capable of having quality prints or quality evidence and they take it back and determine whether it is useable or not. We don't leave that up to the citizens or the officers on the street. All we want them to do is come out there when we call them and as I indicated before, our command officers and our Investigative Operations Unit (IOU) are under the direction and we do check on it to call them

because at some point and time, the Crime Scene Unit, we hired them and told them that they were being underused and we want to make sure that they were overused.

Comm. Hampton asked is there no case situation where a citizen may request dusting or something?

AC Shoulders stated that has happened before and we have had people to call and state that somebody has broken into their home and asked if we could send someone out. It does not do any good. We will still make the request and I don't need officers out there getting complaints stating that we are not..... We leave it up to the request. We tell the Crime Scene Unit and request that they go out and see if they can get something, and that has happened before.

DC Reynolds stated that there is another issue that AC Shoulders touched on and that is useable evidence. A lot of times, citizens will say..."I know who it is and it is the guy next door." Once the investigator talks to that person, they may discover that the person had access to that house and if that is the case, dusting for fingerprints has no value because the person had a right to

Comm. Norris stated it doesn't tell you anything.

DC Reynolds stated right, it doesn't tell you anything.

Comm. Norris stated that she has had an opportunity to tour the lab several years ago. She stated that it is really first rate and very professional. It really does the city proud. I have contact with more people in your unit than with any other part of this Department and they have been terrific. They are really polite and professional and know what they are doing. They are quick and tell you how to clean up the fingerprint dust when they leave.

DC Reynolds stated that she did not want to overlook Cmdr. Motley. It is actually her unit.

Comm. Holley asked about the technology and if we are in the 21st Century. I guess we are because you just gave an assessment of where other states are comparable to crime.

DC Reynolds stated that we have wonderful technology; we are just operating in a very challenged facility. It would be nice for the people who do such a good job if they had a facility that was reflective of therapists.

Comm. Norris stated that as it relates to technology, we are the only place in the state other than the State Police that does a lot of this.

DC Reynolds stated that there are seven (7) State Police labs and only three (3) of those are DNA labs. I think that there are maybe twenty-five municipal laboratories in the country which are CODIS certified laboratories. This means that we actually collect the DNA; analyze it and we are certified to enter it into the national system so that is a testament to the good work.

Comm. Holley asked where everybody gets help from the state and we are independent?

DC Reynolds stated that we are the only city in the State of Michigan that provides its own ...(inaudible)

Comm. Holley asked if the Consent Decree affects the Forensic Services Section in anyway, if so, where are we with this?

DC Reynolds stated I don't believe so. I think we have provided good forensic services consistently.

Comm. Holley asked so there is nothing with the Consent Decree that is.....

DC Reynolds stated that the only thing the Consent Decree says is that the certain cases will be thoroughly investigating forensic....(inaudible)

Comm. Holley asked nothing that we have concern with?

DC Reynolds stated nothing that we have been doing.

Comm. Holley asked how do you recruit the personnel since it is scientific or can you be a police officer and desire to work for Forensic Services?

DC Reynolds answered all of the above. In some of the units such as Trace Evidence, Drug Analysis, DNA; those are very specialized units and have very specific educational requirements, which most police officers do not have.

Comm. Holley asked how do you get your

DC Reynolds stated that we have non-sworn personnel in the DNA and all of the science positions for the most part. Occasionally, we will have an officer who

has the appropriate background and that officer has to meet the same requirements as any non-sworn.

Comm. Holley asked so we don't do any home growing?

DC Reynolds stated that our Forensic Technician program which starts out with the Crime Scene. That is part of the purpose of that and those are people who really don't qualify for our professional positions and we try to grow them and actually we have grown police officers. We have one who started off as a civilian technician and came on the job and is now in the Crime Scene Unit. The Firearms Unit, which is a two-year apprenticeship program. It is a little hard to recruit people because it is two professions because they also do the Bomb Disposal Unit and I like to refer to them as my special people. Polygraph which is a degree usually in one of the social sciences. Everyplace is different.

Comm. Holley stated that is my concern because policing has a culture of its own. How do the home grown have career opportunities and incentives to try and get a rookie to understand that four (4) years from now, he or she did this, or they can go into this area. In terms of trying to do some internal home growing to make sure that the police officers in Detroit have an opportunity. To spend 25 years in a police department and receive one or two stripes...Am I making sense to you?

DC Reynolds stated that she has been awhile and scientists tend to be scientists. It is difficult to get police officers who want to do the science or who are really good at it. The science that we do is real science so we really need scientists.

Comm. Holley asked would it work if we had a program at Wayne County Community College or had a program with Eastern or Wayne State University or something where by the recruiting of police officers would be on that level?

DC Reynolds stated that Wayne County Community College or Eastern Michigan does not really offer the kind of science that we need. Our DNA unit leader has a Masters in Forensic Science from George Washington University.

Comm. Holley asked but the question is why don't they?

DC Reynolds stated that is just not what they want to be.

Comm. Holley stated Wayne State is here; they do research there and it is one of the best medical schools is in Wayne State. My internship was in Medicine and working my way through Seminary. I know that there are all kinds of fields and I am just asking because it doesn't exist doesn't mean that we are not to make some effort to crystallize or ask Wayne State to be in Detroit but Detroit is

not in Wayne State. We have a police department that could somehow take advantage of the science that they are using for medical that we could use for policing.

DC Reynolds stated that we have had discussions with Wayne State and actually that is where I came from Wayne State with my undergraduate in Chemistry. I did some Graduate work at Wayne State in Chemistry but they didn't have a forensic program and I turned down the opportunity to be sworn because I was a scientist and I wanted to go to the laboratory. In places like North Carolina, they recruit Ph. D Master Scientists and then send them to the police academy to make them sworn so everyone in their lab system is sworn. We have both non-sworn and sworn. If we had a sworn person who is on our transfer list, who met those requirements, they could conceivably be in a laboratory. We have had sworn scientists, in fact, we still have one (1) police officer who has a degree in Chemistry and assigned to the laboratory. The Crime Scene Unit, if we have a person who is really interested in forensics, that is where they would go to the Crime Scene Unit and where they have an opportunity if they really want to be a professional scientist, that is where they have an opportunity to do that. We do about as well as we can.

Comm. Holley stated that I am sure of that. It is just that you have six (6) people doing the work of thirty people. You are budgeted for thirty-four and you have six (6).

DC Reynolds answered no, we are six (6) short.

Comm. Holley stated okay you have six (6) short. I am just wondering why all of these universities that are in our arms reach. I don't understand why we can't do better by not doing joint relationships with research institutions.

DC Reynolds stated that we do. We also participate in internship programs. Michigan State University is the university in the state that has the Forensic program. They start out with undergraduate program in which over the last couple of years change to a Masters program. We have had interns from the University of Central Florida, George Washington University, Northeastern University, University of Alabama, which are the major forensic programs.

Comm. Holley stated that students in Detroit that attend Wayne County Community College, Wayne State University or University of Michigan; internships should be right here.

DC Reynolds stated all they have to do is call me and if they get their counselor to write a letter; we have had students who are in science curriculums do internships that were brought in as extra curriculum program.

Comm. Holley stated thanks for your patience.

Comm. Hampton asked do you have tools for the citizens?

DC Reynolds stated that we are not a handicap accessible facility so we can't be open to the public.

7. DISCIPLINARY APPEALS ARGUED – APPEALS SUBCOMMITTEE

DISCIPLINARY APPEALS ARGUED

APRIL 22, 2004

(CORRECTED COPY)

POLICE OFFICER KENNETH GERMAIN

BPC 03-014D

BADGE 4675

Charges on Appeal

- I.** Neglect of Duty, Specification 1; and
- II.** Willful Disobedience of Rules and Orders, Specifications 3-5.

Penalty

Six (6) months suspension of department license; completion of a remedial driving course; and a ninety (90) days suspension, with seventy (70) of the days held in abeyance for one year.

Recommendation

Reverse the finding of guilt as to Specification 3, and **reduce** the penalty to a thirty (30) days suspension, with twenty (20) of those days held in abeyance for one year.

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to accept the recommendation.

SECOND: **Comm. Hampton** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative

POLICE OFFICER ERIC RABY

BPC 03-015D

BADGE 1996

Charges on Appeal

II. Willful Disobedience of Rules and Orders, Specifications 3 and 4.

Penalty

Ten (10) days suspension, with five (5) of the days held in abeyance for one year. The days will only go into effect if there is misconduct of a similar nature.

Recommendation

Reverse the finding of guilt as to Specification 3; and **reduce** the penalty to a **suspension of five (5) days**.

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to accept the recommendation.

SECOND: **Comm. Hampton** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative

POLICE OFFICER CHARLES DUDLEY
BADGE 4526

BPC 03-018D

Charge

I. Failure to be Punctual in Attendance to All Duties Including Roll Call and Court Appearances, Specifications 1-5.

Trial Board Decision

Accepted guilty plea as to

And Penalty

Specifications 2 and 5; found guilty of Specification 3; and not guilty of Specifications 1 and 4.

Nine (9) days suspension, with dismissal held in abeyance for one year. Any attendance related violations would be grounds for implementing the dismissal.

Recommendation

Accept agreement of the parties: dismissal of Specification 3 by the Department, and reduction of the penalty to a suspension of three (3) days.

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to accept the recommendation.

SECOND: **Comm. Hampton** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative

8. APPROVAL OF STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

Comm. Norris stated the Standard Operating Procedures for the Office of the Chief Investigator (OCI) were revised to comply with certain provisions of the Consent Decree. Those revisions were submitted to the Monitor and the Monitor made some modest changes to those and we are now resubmitting them.

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to approve the revisions to the Standard Operating Procedures for the Office of the Chief Investigator.

SECOND: **Comm. Hampton** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative.

9. APPROVAL OF GENERAL ORDERS

Comm. Norris stated that Directive 202.1 – Arrests & Confinement of Material Witnesses and Training Directive 04-01 – Arrests & Confinement of Material

Witnesses were presented to the Board and were tabled so that the policy committee would have ample opportunity to review them. There are have been no pertinent changes recommended.

Directive 202.1 – Arrests & Confinement of Material Witnesses

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to approve the above Directive.

SECOND: **Comm. Hampton** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative.

Training Directive 04-01 – Arrests & Confinement of Material Witness

MOTION: **Comm. Norris** made the motion to approve the above Directive.

SECOND: **Comm. Hampton** seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in attendance voted in the affirmative.

Comm. Holley asked Comm. Norris if these were orders that have to be reviewed by the community?

Comm. Norris stated that the community was advised before it was presented so that they could be aware of it being presented and then they had the opportunity to make any comments. At this point, what will happen is that it will go to the Monitor; the Monitor may well come back with recommended changes. We won't know that until they have had an opportunity to review it. If they do that, then we will go through the same kind of process again.

Comm. Holley asked so the community will be involved one way or the other?

Comm. Norris answered yes, and the other thing, I think the Board was advised last week and we are just reminding that members of this Board had appropriately

questioned how the community was being notified of various things so meetings with our staff and the Chief's staff to better get the word out. It is clear that the community

has had time to make comments but whether everybody who might be interested has been appropriately notified is something that has been worked on.

10. DISCUSSION OF GENERAL ORDERS

- **Directive 204.1 – Canine (K-9) Operations**
- **Directive 304.1 - Firearms**
- **Directive 304.3 - Chemical Spray Device**
- **Directive 305.6 - Detainee Bonding**

Comm. Hampton asked if the community has had a chance to review these General Orders before we have a discussion?

Comm. Norris answered no. This is the first presentation of these so we will hear what Inspector Fields has to say and we will ask any questions we might want to ask and we will not be voting today for there will be time for people to be able to have any comments or input. We have generally been holding them for two (2) weeks unless there seems to be a need for further discussion beyond that and we have asked that the Department make sure that copies are available so if people want to take a look at the drafts, they can do that.

The presentation was given by Inspector Jamie Fields, Planning and Accreditation Section and assisted by Sgt Omar Feliciano, Public Information Section.

Directive 305.6 – Detainee Bonding

Questions

Comm. Norris asked so what they can get bonded for has not changed?

Inspector Fields stated it has not changed.

Comm. Norris asked we are not using them in that capacity?

Inspector Fields stated we do not use them in that capacity.

Comm. Blackwell asked if a police officer is with a canine and they come in contact with a potential suspect and for some reason, he has to arrest the suspect and the individual suspect attacks the police officer; does the dog sit there?

Insp. Fields stated probably not. That is for self-defense and not a method of When people think of dogs biting people, they usually are because the way other

departments train it. They do what is called off the leash searches. They will send the dog into a field or building to look for somebody and the dog will bite somebody if a person moves too suddenly or whatever based on the dog's training. We do mostly on leash searches; in fact, when we go into a building, it is a policy of the Detroit Police Department, that a officer has to search a three or four-story building, and on each floor he searches, he has to announce out loud that he has a trained canine and that if you don't come out, there is a possibility that you will be bitten. They have to make that announcement on each floor. It is in our policy that if they know that someone does not speak English or a different language; they have to get an interpreter in there and give that same warning before they go in the building floor-by- floor.

AC Shoulders stated that he used to work in the Canine Unit and we did not train our dogs to bite. One of the reasons that we do that is that the dogs on the leash; even your pet dogs when you walk up on the dog and startle him, he is subject to bite you. That is why when we go in, we let everyone know that we are coming in with a dog and don't jump out there and start kicking at him. We do not train our dogs to bite.

Comm. Blackwell stated that if he was a police officer and getting attacked; I would want my dog to bite.

Insp. Fields stated that is why the dogs are being included because of their use of force potential. I am never going to say that a dog will not bite.

Comm. Blackwell stated that it would be terrible if you were getting worn out and the dog would just be sitting there looking.

[Directive 304.3 – Chemical Spray Device](#)

Questions

Comm. Holley asked why don't we have an attempt to harm our officers?

Insp. Fields stated that is in the policy. The policy says an attempt to harm another officer or another.

Comm. Blackwell stated that as you clearly use spray; you have outlined the guidelines in which it is appropriate and not appropriate. The issue is how do you know that somebody has a respiratory issue like asthma, or emphysema?

Insp. Fields stated that it is an issue that comes up with anytime you spray someone and usually most of the studies indicate that is not an issue but we have a whole

medical protocol to follow as far as if everybody is in stress. First, we give them an opportunity to decontaminate themselves such as flushing and contacts. There is a

whole protocol as far as telling them not to put salves on because it exacerbates the problem. Then we call EMS, if the situation warrants it, so we have a listing for officers to look for.

Comm. Norris asked am I correct, Inspector? That part of the Consent Decree and I know that this has not come to us yet because it is probably not ready yet but part of it is a change in some of those medical protocols so that not only is all of the information gathered which I think we probably were gathering historically, but then it is given to the right people so that someone going into the holding cell would know of the conditions of anybody in that cell. It is not just like in a desk drawer.

Comm. Blackwell stated that is just under that system but you still have it out on the street?

Insp. Fields stated right, out on the street; but exactly what Comm. Norris was saying is right that part of the Consent Decree calls for protocols as far as communicating information from transporting to conveying so when you do an intake form, you will know if someone is asthmatic so in the cellblock, it would be less of a problem than out on the street.

Comm. Norris stated because there were problems where the arresting officer would get the information or intake officer would get the information but the people dealing with the person didn't know and weren't giving medications or doing other things(inaudible)

Insp. Fields stated to read from the policy it says that if a person complains of continued effects after having been decontaminated or indicated that they have a pre-existing medical condition, for example: asthma, emphysema, bronchitis or heart ailment that may be aggravated by a chemical spray. The person shall be immediately conveyed to the area for medical treatment.

[Directive 304.1 – Firearms](#)

Questions

Comm. Norris asked does that mean if I am an officer that I have a CCW and I have my own weapon; while I am on duty, I don't have that weapon?

Insp. Fields stated right and we cover that in the policy. That is something that we put in the policy because of the CCW laws now, we didn't want officers to say that I have a CCW and I can carry these. Whether they are on-duty or off-duty, if they choose to carry a weapon, we can mandate what weapon they carry.

Comm. Holley asked so you would put a police officer on the street without a gun?

Insp. Fields stated no. They won't be on the street; but they will be on an administrative inside capacity.

Comm. Hampton asked does their pay and benefits status change when they are restricted?

Insp. Fields stated no, it does not. If they fail to qualify the first time, they have immediate remediation and they go back real quick.

Comm. Ramirez asked is there a time table or do you keep them out for so long?

Insp. Fields stated I believe it is about 45 or 60 days. They only get four (4) tries and I believe it is 45 days, and then we will put them in for type of disciplinary action.

Comm. Blackwell asked you take away the police issued gun and does it also restrict the CCW ?

Insp. Fields stated right and we also give them a form to sign that says that we are revoking their authority to carry any gun on behalf of the Detroit Police Department.

Comm. Norris asked what about personally?

Comm. Blackwell stated we are not asking that, we are asking.....

Insp. Fields stated yes, we can restrict them because

Comm. Blackwell stated I am not asking what you can do, what is the policy?

Insp. Fields stated the policy restricts them from carrying any weapon.

Comm. Blackwell asked at anytime if they are restricted from this one?

Insp. Fields stated right.

Comm. Blackwell asked are you sure?

Insp. Fields stated I will double check but I am pretty sure that we can do it.

Cmdr. Godbee stated that legally we can't restrict them from obtaining a CCW or legally carrying a weapon for a criminal reason. For instance, if a person obtains a CCW as police officer; they can carry the weapon. However, administratively, because of policy, if they are found to be in possession of a weapon that is not

authorized by policy, we have the administrative remedy, but you are absolutely right, we cannot stop them from carrying it legally.

Comm. Norris stated right, but I guess that is

Cmdr. Godbee stated that there would be an administrative problem if that person is found to be in possession of a weapon that is not authorized by this Department.

Comm. Blackwell asked if you have an administrative policy, basically you should not be carrying any weapon once you are restricted as a police officer to carry one, but legally you have a right to carry one?

Cmdr. Godbee stated and that is just as a private citizen that does not cover a police officer.

Comm. Blackwell asked you are not really a private citizen when you are a sworn police officer?

Cmdr. Godbee stated no you are not but we have researched the legal aspect of that and the legal thing we have been given is that we can prohibit that; however, we have to when it is discovered through whatever means we will administratively go after very aggressively to make sure that we protect the Department's interest. It won't eliminate our risk but it will certainly mitigate our risk by us at least having a policy in place. So if a person decides to transgress our policy; we have taken appropriate action and at least mitigated our risk as to that person carrying a weapon because they are not carrying it under the collar of law as a law enforcement officer.

Comm. Norris asked so our policy is as a member of the Detroit Police Department the only weapon you can have is the one we issue and authorize you to carry? If you don't meet our requirements, you can't have it?

Cmdr. Godbee stated you cannot carry it; that is correct.

Comm. Blackwell stated well, you should not carry it. It is a difference between cannot and should not because he is saying legally he can't restrict them from carrying it legally.

Insp. Fields stated I think the question is we can't charge them criminally but still administratively we are restricting them.

Comm. Blackwell stated that I am just looking at the whole issue of the city's liability.

Cmdr. Godbee stated that is how we find how we best We can't totally get rid of any liability because we train the person; we put them out under the collar of law as a Detroit Police Officer; they are our employees. However, we can mitigate our risks by

enforcing this policy administratively. Even though, we can't control the legal aspect of a CCW law and prohibiting them from getting a CCW or carrying a different weapon; administratively, we have done what we can legally to mitigate our risks.

Comm. Norris stated we are trying to make a clearer line between the private and the

Comm. Blackwell asked when you say you can't do it; have you tried to do it?

Cmdr. Godbee stated that is a different issue. We haven't had a test case yet. This is a new policy so when it comes to bear, we haven't resolved the trying test.

AC Shoulders stated Mr. Blackwell what I think we are trying to do with this is that they still have the right as a private citizen. We actually are telling them when we put them in their status that we revoke their police authority. They do not have the authority to get out there and act as a citizen whether they get their gun or not, state I am a Detroit police officer and I can do this

Comm. Blackwell asked so they are not like an officer....

AC Shoulders stated they can do what you do. What you do as a private citizen. We try to mitigate our liability. The goal is to tell them that is why they signed something and you cannot take police authority out there on the street.

Comm. Blackwell stated that makes it a little clear. So in effect, by policy, once they are restricted, they are no longer really theoretically a police officer?

Cmdr. Godbee stated this tantamount to a suspension with pay.

AC Shoulders stated that we had this back in 1985; we actually used to take guns and issue a restricted duty to officers that were disabled and couldn't work but a couple of them got into altercations in the suburbs taking police action, and we felt that if they could take police action out there, they could work for us so we actually begin to take the guns from officers and issue restricted duty cards to officers and that was back in the 1980s. There is precedent and we did it before.

Comm. Blackwell stated that it sounds to me as you go forward, I think that is very important and I relate it back to the whole issue of officers allowed to drink off-duty but they are still an officer carrying a gun.

Cmdr. Godbee stated actually we have addressed that.

AC Shoulders stated we have a rule on that, too.

Comm. Blackwell stated there is a rule that states what they shouldn't do and there is the city's liability in terms of if they do it. As you go through contract negotiations that deal with the union, if we revoke this, they don't have any right to carry. What we are saying is that are they agreeing to this upfront or not? The Consent Decree has some impact, probably on the collective bargaining agreement.

Cmdr. Godbee stated it will, yes sir.

Comm. Blackwell stated it will. Not that the city changed it but we are being compelled under a federal decree sort of speak. I am just saying that it sounds like you guys are very conscious of all of that.

Cmdr. Godbee stated yes we are.

Comm. Blackwell stated okay.

Comm. Holley asked let's assume the officer has the city at interest, are you making us feel that this policy secures the city and I am not concerned about the officer feeling like he has my best interest; I want to make sure I got my best interest so I am asking are you tell us that this is in the city's best interest to give him an option? Number two, if he violates that because I assume he doesn't have my best interest? What damage does that put to the city in terms of violation?

Insp. Fields asked meaning violates what?

Comm. Holley stated in other words, he decides to take his equipment and does something wrong on a second job; how does that

Insp. Fields stated the city buys in the liability basically. The city has enormous liability exposure.

Comm. Holley asked why would we leave it up to an officer? Why would we restrain and we wouldn't we protect the city? Why leave it up to an officer to make that decision?

Insp. Fields asked Commissioner are you talking about the outside employment or the carrying?....

Comm. Holley stated yes.

Insp. Fields stated no the outside employment.....

Comm. Holley stated no, I am talking about carrying...

Insp. Fields asked having the choice of carrying the gun? Well, the one reason

Insp. Fields stated allow me to answer

Comm. Holley stated well maybe this is not relevant.....

Comm. Norris stated no, go ahead.

Insp. Fields stated that the reason why is that before we institute this policy, and the reason the policy is because it is now only best practice all over the department and they are doing and it goes into the overall picture of what the Consent Decree is looking at. Another reason why is when we looked at studies that have been done by different organizations around the country as far as off-duty police action; consistently it is like the majority of officers action involves personal controversy, and it doesn't involve the interests of the city. We don't want to inhibit any officer from taking the interest of the city because officers are still going to have to carry firearms; they are still conscientious officers on behalf of the city but we are trying to avoid the liability exposure from people who are taking personal controversies because we are not telling them they have to carry a gun.

Comm. Holley stated knowing human nature as we do; say the officer, if he or she decides to have a Detroit firearm, work at a nightclub, gets into an altercation and shoots someone; does that put Detroit city at liability?

Insp. Fields stated yes it does.

Comm. Norris stated yes.

Comm. Holley asked if it does why are you giving him that option? Why are you giving the officer; protect the city.

Insp. Fields stated they don't have an option.

Comm. Norris stated that under the old policy that our officers had to have their gun with them at all times, 24-7. So, if an officer was working somewhere else; if an officer got drunk; if an officer got into a personal altercation; whatever it was, they had their gun because we told them they had to have their gun, which meant if something happened, it was likely to come back and bite the city. The Consent Decree now requires that in certain situations, an officer not be allowed to have a gun, like if they are intoxicated to a certain level, and we are also saying in other certain situations, like outside employment, they cannot have the gun. So they don't have the option to have it, it is now under certain circumstances, they have the option to not have it and we are telling them in some situations that they can't have it which is very different from what we used to do. They can still break the rule and still take their gun. We certainly still have some exposure but as Commander Godbee stated, we have less exposure if we have a clear policy that we enforce that says you are not supposed to be handling a gun.

Comm. Blackwell stated you are saying two different things. What he is talking about is working at a nightclub as a police officer illegal, isn't it?

Insp. Fields stated yes.

Comm. Blackwell asked so anybody doing that is breaking the law anyway?

Insp. Fields stated we can still.....

Comm. Blackwell stated you cannot work as a police officer off-duty at a nightclub with your issue?

Insp. Fields stated the contract changed to allow officers to....

AC Shoulders stated we changed in the city of Detroit where we are responsible for the rules and regulations of the license. We can still deny an officer to work in a nightclub or any security where it is licensed through the city of Detroit and we regulate it. On the other hand, an officer now lives in Canton or Traverse City can actually submit an outside employment request stating that he wants to work as security for Home Depot is something that we didn't allow them to do when they worked for us. Theoretically, now we cannot deny that he can do now but we also let them know that you cannot use our uniform, our department equipment, or our identification card, and we make them sign for it on the back of it. Now if they get out there and do it, I often wonder what would happen then but we haven't then, they would actually would be in violation of the policy of their own contract.

Comm. Holley stated and our legal department says that mitigates the word that Cmdr. Godbee uses, litigates our liability. My concern is that, the Consent Decree is fine but what other cities are doing fine but we are the ones that are broke. We are the ones that have to pay all of this legal stuff. Why give folks options when you don't have to?

Comm. Blackwell stated let's just say we have financial trouble, we are not broke.

Comm. Blackwell asked Assistant Chief Shoulders in the last labor contract, it was allowed for police officers to have outside employment under certain conditions; prior to that, they couldn't do it?

AC Shoulders stated no, they could still have outside employment.

Comm. Blackwell asked as a security person.....

AC Shoulders stated no, prior to that time, we didn't allow them to do security type work, working in anything controlling our Michigan Liquor, and things of that nature.

Comm. Blackwell stated so as a result of the union negotiations, that was a give-back.

Insp. Fields stated that is correct. I think we are allowed to work at Home Depot.

Comm. Blackwell stated they didn't have it before and now they have it. Something has happened.

Insp. Fields stated it was negotiated through the contract.

Comm. Blackwell stated okay.

Comm. Holley asked when you have officers without resident rule, they can come from the Upper Peninsula or anywhere else; how do you control this? I am not sure that the rule reflects the culture that has happened in these last few years in terms of these contracts? How are you going to control that?

Comm. Blackwell asked isn't there a raise restriction?

Insp. Fields stated yes there is.

AC Shoulders stated I want to correct something. I don't think that we went in and gave away the outside employment. What happened is that the arbitrator had weigh and took the last best offer and.....

Comm. Blackwell asked is that in arbitration offer?

AC Shoulders stated yes and that was the last best offer.

Comm. Blackwell asked did you agree to it?

AC Shoulders stated no, we did not give that away only what we didn't regulate. The police department has to be in a position to regulate it in the city which almost through MFCC, things of that nature, all of these other things like security guards at Home Depot and the Home Quarters outside of the city; we don't regulate those security jobs out there.

Insp. Fields stated that is one of the reasons for giving the option. The city of Detroit has liability exposure but we don't get a benefit from a officer working at Home Depot in Sterling Heights. So there is no benefit but there is exposure.

Comm. Blackwell stated I think that gets back to the crux of the whole issue here with the policy is that there is this whole big push take residency away on the last 20-25 years. It is finally got taken away under the last administration. My issue is that nobody has really talking about the other effects of what it means and the issue is

that is very difficult when you talk about not having a limit but you talk about allowing outside employment outside of the city; you are really talking about a different kind of officers than you are historical who not only live in the city but they work there even if it is something unrelated or restricted. So the point is that has to be in any policy whether it is legislative or whatever, obviously, there is a cause and effect, so everybody should be talking about everybody has a right as a employee in the collective bargaining, etc., we should be talking about community policing. The issue is I think what I hear and what my colleagues are saying in light of the Consent Decree and in light of the community concern, there needs to be not only a debate on this whole issue of how we adopt the policy but are there some things that we may need to go and read up in the legislature because 312 did not give away residency, the legislative peon did. The point is I have said that and said that but I just think that there is more and more signs that things are relative to what you are speaking about happening relative to the cultural differences, familiarity, etc. I would to keep that on the forefront with this group because I think that if we keep ignoring it but it seems like in every step that more and more is taken away relative to the city's authority to have control over its employees.

Comm. Holley stated we have to talk about the risks.

Comm. Blackwell stated there is always a risk. The other issue is the effectiveness of the force.

11. OTHER BUSINESS

Commencement Exercises

Comm. Norris stated that on Sunday, May 2, 2004, Kellie D. Williams will be receiving her Bachelors Degree from Davenport University.

Budget Hearing

Comm. Norris stated that Assistant Chief Shoulders may not know the answers to the questions we are requesting so if he could relay the message back and maybe we could begin with the information. There was a fair amount of budget flack today and under the Charter, we were supposed to review the budget; not our budget, the Department's budget. We are supposed to review it and I don't believe that it happened this year so I don't believe that this is a budget that we have ever seen.

The issue has to do with whether there is a mistake or miscommunication or chain or what not in the Executive Protection Unit. Assistant Chief Shoulders if you could ask if the Board be given; it could be a memo or something that explains what the Chief's position is regarding that. My understanding is that she gave a statement this morning indicating that what was in the paper was an error but I didn't hear it so I am

not sure exactly what her position is. But if we could get that information, that would be very helpful.

AC Shoulders stated I will deliver it to you, Ms. Norris but I will tell you that was an error. The Executive Protection Unit comes under me; they are budgeted for 21 positions and they have 18. The Chief told the reporter in this room yesterday that it was an error and it was moving some unfunded positions when we got ready to disband the Housing Unit last year and if you had even looked at what was written down, one lieutenant from Housing; four sergeants; you would have seen none of those individuals when we did away with Housing. It was just some scribbling down that some way got into there. The Chief explained it to the media yesterday; that it was an error.

Comm. Norris asked so the budget that was submitted had a mistake because it said 27?

AC Shoulders stated yes it did.

Comm. Norris asked and that was a mistake? My understanding also is that it was switched from being, it used to be called Mayor's Security, and now it is the Executive Protection Unit and so that it showed last year 21 for Mayor Security and 0 for this year, and this year the 27 for the Executive Protection Unit so it was put under a different category.

AC Shoulders stated no, it was 21 for the budget here last year and it has been Executive Protection Unit ever since it has been under me and that was Mayor Security several years ago, and for the 2004-05 Budget last year when we first started talking about doing away with Housing and we were moving the lieutenants into unfunded positions so we didn't lose them. We put some under Operations when the Executive Protection Unit came under me, some into Tactical Services Section (TSS), and some here to keep from losing them and that is what those were over there. If you look, the Executive Protection Unit is budgeted for 21 people, and they have 18 over there. That was explained to the reporter that sat in here yesterday. We explained everything to them and the Chief explained it this morning so there was no intent or anything; it was simply a slow news day.

Comm. Norris stated that her question is not much content or not, it just that I see in the paper that it shows the number was 27 so I just want to confirm that it was a mistake and the number isn't.

AC Shoulders stated that you can take my word for it ma'am.

Comm. Norris asked can you also confirm that the budget wasn't brought to us and make sure that it is something that is supposed to happen and that the budget comes to us and that we have an opportunity to review it?

AC Shoulders stated I will check on that right now. I will find out because I don't know.

Comm. Blackwell stated let me make a point and I accept full heartedly which Assistant Chief Shoulders says but as a former Commissioner, whether it is a mistake or not, as a Council member, they can make a mistake by eliminating what they want to eliminate so when you get the budget, the budget is under the domain of the City Council. All that the Mayor and the Executive Department does is propose it and you can cut in half. So to keep trying to make it a story like he is trying to get this; he doesn't have to get anything if you don't want him to have any. This issue is than when you go back and find out that the issue is 21 budgeted, same as last year and they only filled 18 is the issue of the fact that they are explaining that sometimes rather than lose a position, you put them in different places. I have had the opportunity to work with the late Coleman Young and I don't think that the Executive Protection Unit has grown at all and also through Dennis Archer, I think it has stayed the same.

AC Shoulders stated that it is lower than it should be.

Comm. Blackwell stated that it might be lower. I think that it is okay to have the information but to make it look like they are trying to add 6 positions in light of budget cuts, it is irresponsible and certainly when people have the information, but when the City Council gets a budget, they can look at the budget and decide they don't like anything and the Mayor has one thing that he can do and that is veto. All they have to do is come up with six (6) people.

AC Shoulders stated Mr. Blackwell I think if you look at the tape, and I do believe that they record all of the Council meetings to hear when we were there the other day. I believe if you look at when they brought that up, the Chief looked and said "wait a minute, that can't be, I have to get back with you", unless they can edit the tape out. I do believe she said that.

Recommendation for Hire at the Office of the Chief Investigator

Comm. Blackwell stated there was a recommendation for three (3) hires for Investigators at the Office of the Chief Investigator (OCI). I have asked that we delay that until our next meeting when we get a copy of the resumes to all of the Board members. I have reviewed it and we have asked the Board to make the recommendation and hire them. I am comfortable but get the other information in front of the other Commissioners so we can move on it at our next meeting

Comm. Hampton stated that we will now have the General Orders discussion as well as the Oral Communications from the audience.

12. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Mr. Cracchiolio wished to make a comment regarding the Mayor wanting an increase in police security that was in the newspaper today. He asked are there any other city employees that have police security or police protection?

AC Shoulders stated the Executive Protection Unit is under me. Take my word for it, the Mayor has not requested anything from me. I don't even think he knows how many people I have over there. Secondly, City Council and the City Clerk has police security.

Mr. Craccioholio stated there is a councilwoman that has an officer take her to the beauty parlor and wait for her and bring her back at the end of the day. He asked does that still prevail?

AC Shoulders stated I heard the same thing 2 or 3 years ago, but if he is going there for 24-hours a day, I am certainly not paying him. They are only getting paid for 8 hours a day, which is what comes out the budget.

Mr. Craccioholio stated if we are allowing people to have Detroit Police Officers as their security, then they are denying us that security.

Tawana Morris asked disciplinary actions for police officers that cannot pass the qualifications, could you look at placing them in civilian positions?

Comm. Norris stated the consent decree requires that every officer qualifies twice a year. Also, to be in compliance with the consent decree, you have to be at 95%.

Comm. Blackwell asked as part of your academy training, isn't that part of your initial thing to be a police officer?

Ms. Morris stated that's correct.

Comm. Blackwell stated it is not that you cannot fire one because you have to be able to do that...

Ms. Morris stated you must qualify every time.

Comm. Blackwell asked are you referring to the ongoing qualifications?

Ms. Morris stated yes. She asked is the new reform facility in 36th District Court going to be into affect this year?

AC Shoulders stated we are looking at refurbishing our holding cells, so that we can come into compliance with the consent decree. That was a proposal made by

someone from the county thinking that they could take the top floor of 36th District Court and convert them into holding cells.

Bernice Smith she voiced concerns regarding incidents and comments that were raised during the presentation at City Council's budget hearing.

Ron Scott stated I would to make our television program available to get the word out about these polices. The City's cable outlet should be used more effectively in terms of presenting information.

Comm. Norris stated we did have a team of people meet. She asked I.C.I Sheard to contact Ron and run by him what that team has come up with for better because this is a concern that a number of us share.

Mr. Scott voiced concerns of the language or wording in a paragraph that refers to probable cause according to the Supreme Court.

Comm. Norris stated we need to change that word to person.

Mr. Scott asked is there a policy relating to the handling of animals?

Insp. Fields stated the use of force against canines is covered in the Use of Force Policy that the Board would eventually approve. It limits the situations in which officers....

Comm. Norris asked will that be in the broader Use of Force policy?

Insp. Fields stated yes, it will cover specific situations when officers could use force against an animal.

Comm. Norris stated you could submit something in writing, which you could give a copy to Dir. Goss, the Board and Insp. Fields. If there are changes that your group deems appropriate, we will just ask that you bring those back to us before we vote.

Chairperson Hampton stated we will accept your written communication with suggestions that you feel are appropriate.

13. ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, May 6, 2004, @ 3:00 p.m.
Police Headquarters
1300 Beaubien, Rm. 328-A.
Detroit, MI 48226

14. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

DANTE' L. GOSS
Executive Director
Board of Police Commissioners

DLG/fyh